

Provided below are a series of points for consideration by the Independent Biodiversity Legislation Review Panel.

## **Theme 2: Conservation action**

*What incentives might be effective, efficient and equitable in promoting biodiversity conservation on private land?*

- One incentive that should be considered is arrangement by which owners of private land who do not earn an income from that land but who can prove [tax invoices, receipts, etc.] that they have expended money for biodiversity conservation activities [fencing of water ways, weed spraying, feral animal, control, etc.] should be permitted to obtain a deduction on their local council rates and/or their local land services rates within the year of expenditure.

*What should be the role of organisations and bodies, such as the Nature Conservation Trust, in facilitating and managing private land conservation through mechanisms such as conservation and biobanking agreements?*

- Entities such as the Australian and New Zealand Certified Environmental Practitioner Board should be engaged to facilitate the involvement of Certified Environmental Practitioners in the independent review of biobanking agreements thereby providing a level of assurance to the people of NSW that the delivery of these conservation mechanisms are being checked by competent environmental professionals.

## **Theme 4: Conservation in development approval processes**

*Does the regulatory system adequately protect listed threatened species, populations and ecological communities?*

- In my view, the regulatory system is not adequate because NSW state government agencies and statutory bodies are allowed to decide unchecked if their actions will adequately avoid or impact listed threatened species, populations and ecological communities. What should happen is that all NSW state government agencies and statutory bodies should either have individuals within their organisation who are registered environmental professionals [Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand] check the impact analysis or assessment prior to a decision or the agency or body should be required under biodiversity legislation to engage the services of an external consultant who is a registered environmental professional to check the impact analysis or assessment and to make recommendations.

*Are there other models (international or Australian) that regulate activities impacting on biodiversity that may be relevant to NSW?*

- The model used by the Australian Government for regulating activities that may have, will have or have had an impact of biodiversity considered to be a matter of national significance, in my opinion, is an effective model and there is no reason why this Australian Government model could not be applied in NSW to protect biodiversity of significance to the people of NSW.

## **Theme 5: Wildlife management**

*Is the current framework for wildlife licensing, offences and defences, including those applying to threatened species, easily understood? How can it be improved and simplified to focus on conservation outcomes?*

- The current scientific licensing arrangements could be improved in the following two ways:
  - Only allow relevant persons such as an authorised wildlife officers, registered environmental professionals, endorsed researchers and accredited wildlife carers to hold a scientific licence.
  - Require that all scientific licence holders submit records of observations with 7 days of the event rather than 6 months thereby providing an improved and timely input into relevant wildlife databases thereby reducing the lag period and minimising the risk that management decisions will be made across NSW without the best wildlife information.

--

